

SPEECH

(6)
New

OF

HON. R. HUTCHESON

OF MADISON COUNTY.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MARCH 12, 1860.

THE TENDENCY OF THE PRINCIPLES AND TEACHINGS OF THE REPUBLICAN
PARTY—DISUNION, INSURRECTION, AND NEGRO EQUALITY.

Original copy cut on sides

COLUMBUS:
STATESMAN STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.
1860.

SPEECH OF HON. R. HUTCHESON, OF MADISON COUNTY.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, March 12, 1860.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 12, 1860 }

HON. R. HUTCHESON—*Sir*:—The undersigned Democratic members of the House of Representatives having heard with great pleasure the speech delivered by you this afternoon on House Joint Resolutions No. 5, respectfully request a copy thereof for publication.

W. B. WOODS.
WILLIAM PARR,
WM. BLECKER,
GEO. L. CONVERSE,
JAS. M. STOUT,
W. J. FLAGG,
B. W. CARLISLE,
JOSEPH THOMPSON,
WM. S. TANNEYHILL,
CHARLES POWERS,
G. W. ANDREWS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1860 }

Hon. W. B. Woods and others,

Gentlemen: In compliance with your kind request I place at your disposal for publication the remarks I had the honor to make to the House to day. Accept my thanks for this consideration you have paid me.

Very respectfully, R HUTCHESON.

Joint Resolutions in relation to the recent outbreak at Harper's Ferry.

WHEREAS. The people of the United States, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility" &c., as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, have ordained a government, which embraced, at the time of its formation, and which now embraces both slaveholding and non-slave holding States; and whereas, the union thus formed under the Constitution, constituting, as it does, the closest, most delicate and important relationship that can exist

between communities of people dependent in the local domestic affairs, is an object of the highest concern to all, States composing it, which demands from each, warm and earnest consideration for the peace, safety, prosperity and happiness of all the others; be it therefore

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That the people of Ohio, by their Representatives regard the recent outrage at Harper's Ferry as a crime not only against the Commonwealth of Virginia, but against the government of the United States.

II. That in the spirit of friendship and good neighborhood, and with the assurance of a determined purpose, faithfully to obey all the obligations which the constitution and laws of the land impose upon them, and especially desiring, at this juncture, to express an earnest sympathy with their fellow citizens of Virginia, recently threatened with an attempt to produce a servile revolt in their midst, the people of Ohio greet the people of Virginia, and congratulate them upon the prompt suppression of the attempted outbreak and upon their safe deliverance from the horrors of servile insurrection.

III. That in view of what has recently occurred to excite the alarm of our Southern brethren, the people of Ohio disavow, as they have always done, any right to wish to interfere, in any manner, with the domestic institutions of the other States of the Union.

IV. That, on the contrary, they reprobate in the strongest and clearest terms, all attempts made by any of the citizens of Ohio, whether by invasion, secret instigation, or the promulgation in any form among our people of inflammatory appeals designed or tending to lead to the violent invasion of any slave State, or of incendiary matter among the slave population of any State designed or intending to excite servile insurrection therein, or to arouse those who are lawfully held in servitude to violence and bloodshed; and they most earnestly protest against and denounce as dangerous in tendency and contrary to the plighted faith on which the constitution was formed, all acts whose purpose or effect is to make the Union less perfect, to violate justice between the parties to the constitutional compact, to disturb the domestic tranquility of any State, or to destroy that spirit of friendly intercourse, harmony and mutual forbearance upon which the Union was established, and without which it cannot be perpetuated.

V. *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be enclosed by the Governor to the Governor of Virginia, with the request that they be laid before the Legislature of that Commonwealth.

The foregoing Preamble and Resolutions being under consideration, Mr. HUTCHE-ON of Madison, said:

MR. SPEAKER: I have not introduced these resolutions with any desire or expectation that they would provoke discussion on this floor, or with any hope that they would be the occasion for making a record here, to serve the purpose of any supposed party advantage. I take pride in feeling that I belong to the noble party with which I have the honor to be associated, whose sentiments I know these resolutions reflect, but I have a higher pride in feeling that I belong to the noble State we represent, which is deeply interested in the questions which these resolutions present, and a still higher pride in the consciousness that I am a citizen of the United States, whose union and individual safety are objects of paramount concern.

To be actuated by a mere partizan spirit under the solemn circumstances in which, in my judgment, we are called upon to act, would be to sink the higher consideration in the lower. If gentlemen are to oppose the adoption of these resolutions upon party grounds, the effect must be to imply at least the existence of those very facts, the impression of which it is my desire to remove from the minds of our Southern brethren. I would much prefer, therefore, to see the representatives of the people of Ohio, sinking party for the country, come forward as a unit to perform an office of good neighborhood, and give the assurance in a formal and public manner, of fraternal regard to the people of Virginia and of the entire South, I will say that equally remote from me, is any disposition to indulge in gratuitous servility to what is denominated the "slave power." Servility, sir, in the political nomenclature of those who employ the term is a word of relative significance; to comprehend it fully it is necessary we should occupy the same stand point of those who use it. It will then be discovered that a word which under ordinary circumstances, justly attaches so much odium, by a strange transition and anomaly in public affairs, becomes only a synonym of patriotism and duty. If to recognize and extend the kindly offices of good neighborhood, to deprecate an uprising of the slave population as the most terrible calamity which can befall the country; if to respect the constitutional rights of the South, and regard the union of these States as of the highest concern, but more than imperilled unless better faith is observed and better relations are cultivated between the North and the South, is to be "servile," then I am free to say that I am willing to have my servility published abroad. If to have a proper self-respect and to be "manly," is to follow the example of those who profess a serene indifference about the fate of other States which may tolerate institutions which do not receive their approval, who feel no particular sympathy for the people of those States when threatened with the horrors of a servile insurrection, but rather sport at their fears and apprehensions, while they deck the arm that presents the knife to the throats, and bears the torch to the dwellings of our Southern neighbors; who regard the Constitution of the United States, not as the perfection of human wisdom,

by which the noblest form of government ever yet conceived has been founded, but rather as a "compact with hell," a mere device of wickedness, which has perpetuated a foul wrong; who studiously ignore the laws of the land as being subordinated to "a higher law," affected in their supposed superior moral sense, which dispenses nullification from the *foro conscientie* in the form of *Habeas Corpus* bills, Personal Liberty bills and *mandamus* acts; if all this, I say, is necessary to escape the reproach of time-serving, and constitutes true "manliness," then I am proud to say that I am a time server, and that I am not "manly;" and I pray I shall never have that manly trait of character so amiable in certain quarters. I believe, Representatives, that in the name of the people of Ohio, we are called upon by every consideration of true manliness and proper self respect, to speak out fully and unequivocally in the present posture of affairs, when the position of Ohio is so much misunderstood and so much suspicion rests upon the fidelity of her citizens. Sir, I would not have the impression go abroad, even by the slightest implication, that there seriously exists on the part of the majority of the people of Ohio, if their real sentiments were expressed, any disposition to violate the constitutional rights of the South, much less to disturb her peace and safety by armed invasions. On the contrary, I believe, and would have the South to understand, that the masses of our people, so soon as they shall discover the dangerous tendency of the doctrines of the political party with which a majority of them have been too long acting, will be found faithful to the requirements of inter state comity, immovable in their friendship toward their Southern brethren, and true to the Constitution and the Union.

But, sir, we cannot disguise from ourselves, or conceal from others, the fact that the escatcheon of our fair State has not been left entirely unstained in the recent disgraceful affair at Harper's Ferry. Events have transpired and developments have been made, which, without explanation or some disavowal on our part, are well calculated to cast suspicion upon the people of Ohio, and certainly have not tended to improve our reputable standing at the South. When the news of the seizure of the armory and the engine house at Harper's Ferry first went over the wires, was it not sufficient to fire with indignation the bosom of every loyal son of Ohio, when it was reported that the raid had originated at an Ohio Fair? Whether true or false, like the imputation of crime against an individual whose character is under the ban of suspicion, the effect was equally damaging to the good name of the State. It was within the borders of our State, that several of the conspirators sejournd and held public and private conference with our citizens both humble and distinguished. In Ohio, as in other portions of the North, for many months previous to the outbreak, the plan of an association to be formed for the purpose of making invasions upon the slave States, was extensively circulated, from which I will ask the indulgence of the House to read: "When a human being is set upon by a robber, ravisher, murderer, or tyrant of any

kind, it is the duty of the bystanders *to go to his or her rescue by force if need be. On this principle it is the duty of the non slaveholders of this country, in their private capacity as individuals, without asking permission, or waiting the movements of the government, to go to the rescue of the slaves from the hands of their oppressors — Holding these opinions we propose to act upon them; and we invite all other citizens of the State to join us in the enterprise. To enable them to judge of its feasibility, we lay before them the following programme of measures, which we think ought to be adopted and would be successful:*

1. The formation of associations throughout the country of all persons who are willing to pledge themselves publicly to favor the enterprise, and render assistance and support of any kind to it.

2. Raising money and military equipments.

3. Forming and disciplining such military companies as may volunteer for actual service.

4. Detaching the non-slaveholders of the South from all alliance with slaveholders, and inducing them to co operate with us, by appeals to their safety, interest, honor, justice and humanity.

5. Informing the slaves (by emissaries to be sent among them) of the plan of emancipation that they may be prepared to co-operate at the proper time.

6. To encourage emigration to the South of persons favoring the movement.

7. When the preceding preliminaries shall have sufficiently prepared the way, *then to land military forces (at numerous points at the same time) in the South, who shall raise the standard of freedom and call to the slaves and such free persons as may be willing to join it. And we anticipate that the public avowal of these measures, and our own open and zealous preparation for them, will have the effect within some reasonable time, to detach the government and the country from the interests of the slaveholders and to destroy the value and security of slave property; to annihilate the commercial credit of slaveholders, and finally accomplish the extermination of slavery. We hope it may be without blood. If it be objected that this scheme proposes war, we confess the fact. It does propose war—private war indeed—but, nevertheless war, if that should prove necessary. And our answer to the objection is, that in revolutions of this nature, it is necessary that private individuals should take the lead."*

Mr. Speaker—Whether any associations have ever been formed, or do now exist in Ohio, in pursuance of this circular, how many of our citizens have taken the traitor's "pledge," or whether those who went from Ohio to join in the rebellion upon Virginia did so as members of such associations, are questions that must remain veiled in the dark councils of treason. I know not how many, if any, of our citizens sanction this movement or are prepared to act upon its recommendations; but I do say that the circulation of such reasonable sentiments, unexposed and unrebuked, among any people, is ground for suspicion. If I were to go into any neighborhood, and find the houses full of counterfeiters'

plate, or burglars' tools, my opinion of the honesty of that neighborhood would not be very exalted. But, however this may be, that several of the persons engaged in the Harper's Ferry affair, were citizens of Ohio, is a fact that has already been transferred to history. If the connection of our citizens with this affair stopped here, we might be left simply to lament the folly and madness of so small a number; but events have since occurred which show, whilst so few a number was actually engaged in it, that there is no inconsiderable number who half sympathize with and half approve their conduct.—When the day for the execution at Charlestown was approaching, information was received by the authorities of Virginia, that an extensive combination existed in Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York, bound together by a secret oath, to attempt the rescue of Brown and his confederates, which was so seriously entertained, that the subject led to a formal correspondence between Gov. Wise and Gov. Chase, in which the chief magistrate of Ohio saw proper to declare that he would use all power conferred on him by law to prevent any armed invasion from Ohio into the territory of Virginia, and in which he gave the assurance to Gov. Wise that our people were loyal and peaceably disposed. When the conspirators had been brought to condign punishment, it became more apparent that they had the sympathy of a large portion of the community in the Northern States, and they were boldly defended, or covertly justified, from thousands of pulpits, presses and forums.

At first the excuse of insanity was plead, and then they were openly defended on principle!—Some professed to deprecate their acts, but as if to ask their pardon, began to exalt their motives and eulogize their valor! The *New York Tribune* in an editorial about that time, said "that it would not by one reproachful word disturb the bloody shroud wherein John Brown and his compatriots were sleeping. They dared and died for what they felt to be right, though in a manner which seems to us fatally wrong. Let their epitaphs remain unwritten until the no distant day when no slave shall clank his chains in the shades of Monticello or by the graves of Mt. Vernon." And the *Ohio State Journal*, the central organ of the dominant party of Ohio in an article about the same time declared that "abstract right and every principle of the Declaration of Independence morally justify John Brown."

Even Gov. Chase, after all his assurance to Gov. Wise, could not refrain in his late message, from an expression of his "just admiration of noble qualities by whomsoever displayed;" and although he apparently condemns "all inroads" into other States, it is by a cautious verbiage under which, speaking with forked tongue and in Delphic phrase, our political Talleyrand conceals his real sympathy for John Brown. Sir, it is folly to deny that all through the North from Maine to Kansas, distinct and unmistakable sympathy and endorsement have been expressed for those who fell in an attempt to produce a servile revolt. If these expressions came from the thoughtless and misguided alone, we might be silent. But they come from sources

of grave significance—from men high in political, social and religious positions. Why pointed the one hundred guns upon the air in Albany on the second day of December last? Wherefore the funeral processions all over the North? Why were halls draped in mourning, bells tolled and assemblages convened to hear eulogies and funeral orations? Why the adjournment of Courts of Justice, the attempted disjournment of Senates and Houses of Representatives, and all the usual insignia of public sorrow, bestowed hitherto only on the great and the good, the patriots, the heroes and the martyrs of the world? All these tributes and more have been paid to the memory of men who have most disgracefully suffered for the highest crime known to society. The sad evidences of this corrupt public sentiment are not wanting in Ohio. In Cleveland where the first attempt was made at revolution in Ohio, when bold traitors essayed to lead an insane horde into the Court Chamber clamoring for the overthrow of Constitutional law, it was eminently fit and not entirely unexpected, that the first demonstration should be made of sympathy for John Brown. In Cincinnati, the adherents of Conway and the followers of the political school of Mollitor and Laussarek, numerous congregated, to do homage to the memory of the "sainted martyr," with their tribune draped in mourning, and with a negro in the centre of the stage, acting as standard bearer and holding the flag of the United States! Sir, it is my deliberate conviction that if some bold representative man had appeared at this flood tide of passion and sympathy, if some daring leader like Cromwell had sprung up, a force might have been rallied and precipitated upon the South sufficient not only to rescue the prisoners, but to form the nucleus of an irrepressible revolution. Sir, it is vain to attempt to conceal the evidences of the action and sympathy which have been given to Brown and his confederates, or to conceal the extent of it. There must be a public sentiment behind it all, or it never would have found form and expression. "Do you suppose all these things mean nothing? What the tender and poetic youth dreams to-day and conjures up with an iculate speech, is to-morrow the vociferated result of public opinion"—and the day after, may be the climacteric of revolution! So multiplied a form and so unmistakable in character have been these expressions, but for the counter expression of the patriotic and conservative portion of our people, the South may well have doubted whether our sympathies were on the side of Virginia or on the side of John Brown, whether we thought "Gov. Wise had any more right to hang Brown than Brown had to hang Gov. Wise." Sir, if Ohio now chooses to remain silent it will not be because there are not grave imputations which it behoves her to repel. It is to place the people of Ohio right, so far as his General Assembly may reflect their opinions, that I have introduced these resolutions, and now desire their passage. If to pass these resolutions which will go only as a message of kindness to our Southern brethren, is to reflect upon our own citizens and to truckle to the South, what, sir, shall be said of a meas-

ure which was introduced at the other end of the Capitol, by a Republican Senator, (Mr. Harrison,) and which has been introduced into this House by a Republican member (Mr. Collings) for the purpose of suppressing military expeditions formed in Ohio to invade any other State or Territory? If a state of facts now exists or is likely to exist, which, in the estimation of Republican gentlemen, calls for a law upon our statute books, a Democrat may very well be pardoned for proposing no more than is indicated in the resolutions I have introduced. Mr. Speaker, I have a high personal regard for the distinguished gentleman who originally introduced that measure into the Senate, and I entertain a profound respect for the patriotic motives by which he has been governed. He deserves and will receive the gratitude of the friends of peace and order here and elsewhere, for the moral courage he has exhibited in coming forward to do an act of justice to the South in the face of the political guillotine which has been placed before him. But, sir, I must be permitted to say, that if the time has now arrived, or shall arrive, when it has become, or will become, necessary to provide against armed invasions from one State into another, or to prevent conspiracies and combinations looking to such invasions, the duty of legislation had better be deferred to Congress. The States doubtless possess concurrent jurisdiction in this matter with the General Government. But if it should be left to the States to provide against these evils, it will soon be discovered that the protection which the South will receive will be as vain and hopeless as has been the reliance upon State legislation for the surrender of fugitive slaves. A resolution has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas) requesting the Committee on the Judiciary in that body, to examine and report upon this matter by bill or otherwise, and that Senator has shown conclusively, in my judgment, that Congress not only possesses the power, but that it is incumbent on Congress to pass a law upon this subject.

I know it is urged, Mr. Speaker, against entertaining these resolutions that our attention ought to be confined to matters more particularly affecting our own local affairs. I will go as far as the farthest in discouraging the introduction of subjects into this House not having any manifest pertinence to our constitutional functions, but I do not conceive these resolutions to be of that character.—They express our sympathy with Virginia in a case which has transpired it is true, and if they stopped there, if they had no scope or purpose beyond the mere expression of our good wishes for Virginia in the future, or our congratulations with her people in the past, I might have deferred to the judgment of those who hold that such subjects are beyond the legitimate sphere of our duties, and would not have introduced the resolutions originally, and certainly would not now rise to speak upon them. But they inculcate principles as well as denounce an act—principles, in the application of which Ohio, as a member of the Confederacy, is deeply interested; principles, which, if applied and acted upon in

the future, will certainly prevent the recurrence of outrages like that at Harper's Ferry. These resolutions would fall very much below their obvious meaning and intent, if their application was to be limited to a particular event, transpiring in a particular neighborhood. And whoever classes them among subjects irrelevant and foreign to our office here, not only greatly misconceives them, but stops, himself, very far short of any just comprehension of our duties under the present circumstances and position of affairs in this country. A powerful agitator at the North has said that "the lesson of the hour is insurrection"—that an insurrection of arms must follow the insurrection of thought that has been going on for so many years in this country. Sir, it ought to be known how Ohio reads this lesson. It ought to be known whether or not she is insurgent "in thought," and when the crisis shall have arrived, whether or not she will be prepared to go with the insurgents "in arms." And let me say she cannot be neutral or even silent when this question is put. History will make up an answer for us. If these resolutions truly reflect the sentiments of the people of Ohio, they are not now insurgent in thought nor disposed to be in arms. And if they prevail, the future historian of the Republic who may come back to the records of this general Assembly to see what our opinions were upon a question that must seem to him to have absorbed every other, will find them expressed with clearness and emphasis, and upon the right side. If not, our records will still speak. They will speak against us with the eloquence of indignant silence.—They will disgrace us and disgrace that great constituency which we represent; for they will tell him that in the year 1860—a most interesting period in this sectional controversy—the culminating point of safety or ruin—when feverish strife dropped reason and drew the sword—when our sister States of the South were threatened with insurrections, that the danger to which they were exposed excited in us no particular concern—that when the "Mother of Presidents" and the first great benefactress of the West was menaced with such a calamity, we had no word of sympathy for her nor a word of execration for her invaders. And his mortification must be kindled into indignation when he perceives that in a crisis like this, so critical for the Union itself, when a proposition was made in this House of Representatives to send our countrymen of the South, arrayed in defense of their homes and their hearths, a simple testimonial of our regard for them and their cause, and of our interest in the fate of that venerable Commonwealth that first made the exodus out of colonial bondage and followed her celestial eye-sore through a bloody and protracted revolutionary struggle, that such a proposition was resisted, and that it was objected that our attention ought to be confined to matter of weightier consequence to ourselves—as if anything could be of weightier consequence to us than the preservation of the Union and the inviolable safety of all the States—as if the solitude of our people was to be limited to the geographical boundaries of the State, and as if they did not

feel prouder and safer in standing under the aegis of the American flag.

Mr. Speaker, if I were disposed to plead precedent on this occasion, I imagine it would not be difficult to find when the General Assembly of Ohio have entertained subjects of much less practical moment to their constituents than the subject now under consideration. When Russia put forth her Imperial powers to crush Hungary, Ohio spoke out in solemn protest against the unwarrantable interference.—When Prussia was about to invade Switzerland and the conference of absolutism at Paris was conspiring to blot her out as Poland had been blotted out from the map of Europe, Ohio true to her instinctive love of justice and liberty came forward to express her sympathy for the brave descendants of Tell and Winklereid.—These, sir, were cases arising among people of the other side of the Atlantic, with whom communication by the mass of our people was rare and difficult, differing from us in religion and nationality and not wholly agreeing even in politics. The present is the case of a people of the closest communication, of the same origin, religion, nationality and destiny. Four years ago when Kansas was involved in a disgraceful civil war, a Republican Legislature of Ohio openly committed our State on the side of one of the factions among whose leaders not least conspicuous was this same John Brown. As between the contending parties I will not inquire which was most deserving of our sympathies, for neither can be defended with decency, but it may not be uninteresting to enquire whether a Republican Legislature now are willing to commit us in the same direction when that venerable Apostle of the Irrepressible Conflict sought to carry his "Kansas work" into Virginia. However this may be I deem it appropriate to present the position on this subject of that party in Kansas which the Republicans of Ohio have contributed so largely to build up and sustain. If the published proceedings of a mass meeting held at Lawrence on the 2d day of December last, called together "to enter their protest against American slavery" and "to express their confidence in and sympathy for their former comrade, Captain Brown," I find the following among other resolutions passed:

"Resolved, That while we may have differed with Captain Brown as to the wisdom of his plans for the relief of the slave, we cannot withhold from him the highest honor and respect due to one who endeavored to live up to the golden rule, and that he will be embalmed in our memories as one who has laid down his life for the right of man and in an attempted vindication of the great ideal of the Declaration of Independence, and that he and his comrades will have gone down to no inglorious grave but will swell the noble column of those who have fallen in the great battle of freedom."

It is fair to presume, sir, that this resolution correctly embodies the sentiments of the Republican party in Kansas, for the convention was well attended by all its leading spirits, among whom was Mr. Conway, the present Republican member elected to Congress. Does the Republican party of Ohio recognize this image of itself reflected in its child?

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a precedent for this kind of action by one State towards another

character which makes it peculiarly appropriate to be referred to on this occasion. On the arrival of the Port Bill in Boston, a meeting of the inhabitants of the colony of Massachusetts assembled to express their feelings of indignation and determined resistance, which was longly participated in by the people of the other colonies. Not last to come forward to express herself upon that act of tyranny and outrage was the Old Dominion. History assigns to a noble position in those trying times. "In Virginia, Lord Dunmore, who had been made governor on the death of Lord Botetourt, had provoked the refractory burgesses from time to time until March, 1773. When, in May, 1774, they received the news of the Boston Port Bill they proclaimed a fast. Lord Dunmore at once prorogued them. They, however, formed an association, and voted to recommend to the colonies a general Congress. The first of June, the day on which the Port Bill was to go into effect, was devoutly observed in Virginia as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer to implore that God would avert the evils which threatened them, and give them one heart and one mind firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to the American rights." We had more than once afterwards, in the progress of the Revolution, did Virginia send greeting to her sister colonies her pledge of fidelity and her solicitude. But, *O tempora, O Mores!* The grateful descendants of that early Massachusetts were found a few months ago firing their guns, ringing their bells and flinging their star-banners out to signify their admiration for a cold conspirator who plotted the desolation of the fire sides of the Virginia of to day, and who sought to deliver her cities and villages to conflagration, and her women and children to outrage and massacre. How different and sadly anomalous the present relations between the North and the South. States which were once united by the closest bonds of amity are now separated and estranged. But although now alienated, they are inseparably associated in the past: no angry current can ever ruffle those serene depths of history in which they all lie mirrored together; no sacrilegious hand can ever part that hallowed lustre in which their mingled lights of glory are indissolubly blended. I love to turn to them, covered as they now are with the reproach of infidelity, to the sacrament of Union, and contemplate them wrapt in the vindictive gloomings of a common revolutionary war, which has forever consecrated the patriotism it was able to extinguish. I love to linger around their early history, and follow them through those days of gloom and error when mutual league, united counsels, and equal hopes and hazards so bound them together that "their double bosoms seemed to wear one heart." I love to gaze at them as they stood hand in hand before the altar of liberty, radiant with the glow of its triumphs, and engaged to the meeting souls of their sister States the sacred troth of patriotism, to observe with one another, through all generations, an indissoluble covenant of Union and Freedom. Has Massachusetts repudiated the faith of her ancestors? It is within sight of that star-point

ing pyramid which recalls the memory of her early patriots and heroes, that she applauds treason and rejoices in insurrection! She heeds not the warning of that voice of expostulation which comes from her illustrious dead, which constantly proclaims the great principle that was canonized by their death, that the only bond of unity which can keep together an empire of freemen, is the enforcement of all constitutional guaranties and an equal participation between all the members of the Union, of rights and privileges.

Representatives, we have now lived to witness the practical realization of the dangers against which Washington warned his countrymen.—Never before was the Republic surrounded with such imminent peril. The signs of the times never before portended so much of disaster as at the present. Gentlemen may close their eyes, stop their ears, and sport and mock at "Union-savers," but it will only be to add the disgrace of levity to complicity with treason. Washington was the first Union saver, and Jefferson, Madison and Jackson were all Union savers. Yet in stupid and criminal disregard of their dying admonitions, and in the face of danger, gentlemen would have us go on laughing and singing, like the traveler in the satire with his pockets empty, at a present peril. Sir, it is not we who exaggerate the dangers which surround us, but they who underrate them.

Mr. Speaker, I would not entirely perform the duty which I have undertaken, if I failed to admonish the people of Ohio, from my place here, that such dangers exist, and to convey this admonition with all the gravity, the earnestness and solemnity which belong to the enunciation of a sad truth. The fact that one section has already organized upon a geographical basis to make war upon slavery, and that the other is fast organizing to resist it, must in itself strike every reflecting mind as a dangerous experiment. When it can be said that there is a conflict going on which must ultimately result in making all the free-labor States slaveholding States, or all the slaveholding States free, and that this conflict is "as deep as the foundation of the mountains and as pervading as the atmosphere," it must be apparent that there is an irreconcilable difference between the North and the South, incompatible with their existence in the same Union. When we have already had armed forays from the North into the slave States, retaliated by personal violence upon northern citizens in the South, it shows a temper of mind which only needs the spark to kindle the whole magazine. Sir, the man who has read history to advantage and who has observed the tendency of events in this country, must have been struck with the parallel between the popular feeling which succeeded the Boston Massacre in 1770, and that which followed the Harper's Ferry affair in the South a few months ago. Gentlemen should recollect that fewer persons were engaged and fell in the Boston affray than at Harper's Ferry, yet it proved the precursor of the American Revolution; and in six years afterwards the colonies declared themselves independent of the mother country. Sir, the evidences have multiplied upon us too strong to

fail to convince the least credulous, that in the South there is a growing and profound distrust of the wishes and purposes of the North.—We have been told not by idle declaimers about disunion, not by habitual alarmists, but by men who have been long distinguished for their conservatism and moderation of tone, that their people are absolutely terrified by the evidences which come from the North of sympathy with enterprises which menace Southern communities and destroy the peace of Southern homes. And in view of these facts, the Legislatures of different Southern States have already inaugurated measures looking to a southern confederacy, and conventions have been held not to give vent to the froth and fury of southern ardor, but with the solemn forms of embassy, and speaking in the earnestness of the times that always precede revolution. Resolutions of non-intercourse have been adopted, social ties have been severed, religious communions have been dissolved, and a degree of hatred has been engendered between the North and the South, as violent and unmistakable as that which characterizes two nations about to go to war with each other. We have just seen the representatives of the two sections engaged in a protracted struggle of eight weeks, for the organization of the House of Representatives at Washington, when the Government was brought to the point of explosion, when each day made it more doubtful whether the angry contest was to be settled under the peaceful mode of the Constitution or to end with the revolver and the bowie knife, a contest of such violence and turbulence as could find only a fit parallel in the revolutionary tribunals of Paris. For myself I distrust gentlemen's assurance of safety in the midst of these evidences of danger ahead. It is the singing of Circe—"the voice of the charmer charming never so wisely"—lulling suspicion asleep, and deceiving our own people in regard to the crisis that is upon us.

But, Mr. Speaker, neither one nor all these facts to which I have alluded, have given rise to the excitement in the public mind. "These are all but scenes in the act of a general drama, incidents of a principle, the revelations more or less shadowy of a purpose." They derive their importance chiefly from the fact that they may be the evidences of "an incurable disease in the public mind." The real cause, in my judgment, at the bottom of our national disorders, is the fact that a powerful political organization exists at the North based upon the conviction, pretended or real, that property in a negro slave is a sin and a crime; that the African is the political equal of the white man; that he is a citizen of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding; that in the abstract at least he is justly entitled to all the rights and privileges of other citizens; and finally that the relation of master and slave is incompatible with the idea of Republican institutions. I think I do not misrepresent the doctrines of the Republican party, I take them as expounded by one of the framers of the Philadelphia Platform. He says:

"I speak of the fundamental truths which constitute the basis of our political faith as they constituted the basis of the Declaration of Independence. These

truths are immutable and unchanged as their Divine Author. They must remain forever the basis of our action while the constitution shall be maintained or the *pantheon shall exist*. On matters of policy our platform may be changed to suit occasions as they arise; but the *great central truth on which we all unite must remain unchangeable*. The constitutional powers of government must at all times be wielded to secure every human soul under exclusive jurisdiction in the enjoyment of the right which God has bestowed on him."

Such, sir, are what I conceive to be the fundamental ideas of the Republican party. I understand that party to contend for the application of the doctrines announced in the Declaration of Independence, to the negro, as well as to the white population of the country. In other words it is NEGRO EQUALITY. Gentlemen may disclaim it, but it is the logical sequence of their principles. This definition of republicanism may not be agreeable to those gentlemen who go along with the Republican party "to take care of the baggage," but I am sure nothing less would meet the concurrence of the gentleman from Lake (Mr. Clapp), the gentleman from Huron (Mr. McCune) and the gentleman from Ashtabula, (Mr. Krum.) Every political party must necessarily have its distinctive principles—the *radix* from which the party grows and receives its vitality. I say the vitalizing, animating and underlying principle of the republican organization is hostility to slavery—slavery in the abstract. Hence its opposition to the decision of the Supreme Court; hence its opposition to the admission of any more slave States into the Union; hence its opposition to the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law. If I am asked where the Democratic party stands on these questions, I answer, that it is neither a pro-slavery nor an anti-slavery party, as such; but whilst its members may approve or disapprove the policy of slavery according to the circumstances of locality, climate and production, *they universally controvert the dogma of the equality of the races*, leave the rights of the slaveholder where the Constitution leaves them, and are disposed to leave the negro where nature, experience, uniform public law, and our own laws leave him, *subject to the will and policy of the white race*. And this is the only solution of the question compatible with the existence of the Union or the safety of society.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have not entered upon this question in the spirit of partisanship. It is my purpose rather to rise as far as I am able to the height of this great argument, and treat as one who endeavors to enter into the analysis of moral operations and the discovery of recondite causes. I always admired the maxim of Cicero; *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*. I feel prepared to make the avowment here, with a deliberate conviction of its truth, that the ideas, the principles, the politics of the Republican party are inherently and essentially hostile to the Constitution, inimical to the rights of one half of the Union, and dangerous to the peace of society. If the principle of equality, the idea of the inalienable rights of man, applied to the African, is at the bottom of the Republican organization, and if it is true, then that principle must ultimately lead its advocates to its own logical conclusions. We must sooner or later have rebellion and insurrection at the South

we must have political and social equality for the races at the North. We cannot account for or vindicate the American Revolution on any other principle. If slavery is what it is alleged to be in our school rooms, from our pulpits, in our public lectures, in our political speeches, he can hardly be consistent who stops short in his efforts against it and hesitates at the choice of the necessary means for its extinction. And if the prudent and cautious hesitate, there will always be found those who are too restless for prudence and too bold for calculation. If slavery be a crime against God and humanity, if it be a perpetual violation of the charter of our own liberties, it is time to talk of moderation and non-interference with slavery "where it exists." You might as well undertake to stop the eruptions of sulphur with straw as to prevent the final extinction of those opposing moral causes. If the three millions of slaves at the South are right to believe that they are held in bondage in violation of the theory of our government, they will not only claim the right to rebel and overthrow their oppressors, but they have the right to expect the sympathy and co-operation of all who so believe. I say, therefore, the recent incursion into Virginia is, in my judgment, the logical, necessary, and inevitable consequence of the principles and teachings of the Republican party. Harper's Ferry fits the Republican era as exactly as the glass slipper fitted the foot of Cinderella. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that those who are nominally identified with the Republican party, approve the late acts of John Brown, or are prepared to follow any future John Brown, but I do say it will be vain for gentlemen to disown and denounce such raids, whilst they adhere to the principles which lead to them. I know there are two classifications of the anti-slavery sentiment at the North, and that one does not now occupy the extreme ground of the other. But I assert it, as a proposition sustained by all history, that those who now shrink back from the doctrines of the extreme end of the party will, if they continue to co-operate with them, be driven to the assumption of their opinions. Thirty years ago the anti-slavery party only asked for the right of petition and for free discussion, now it has cemented the entire North in a crusade against slavery in every form. In 1835 at the inception of the abolition movement, William Lloyd Garrison said: "We have never advocated the right of physical resistance on the part of the oppressed, we assure our assailants that we would not sacrifice the life of a single slaveholder to emancipate every slave in the United States."

In 1859, Wendell Phillips, who represents the same sentiments. In his speech at Brooklyn not long since, in speaking of the incursion into Virginia, said: "It is the natural result of anti-slavery teaching; for one I accept it; I expected it." Wendell Phillips is as truthful as he is logical.

When the abolition of slavery in the West Indies was first agitated, the best statesmen of England opposed it. Mr. Pitt, with that sagacity which so eminently distinguished him, declared that "to think of emancipating the slaves would be little short of insanity." When it

was proposed in the House of Commons, Mr. Canning was shocked at its madness, exposed its fallacy and saved the colonies. But the abolition sentiment gained ground, and organized societies to accomplish its objects. Its purposes were suspected, and so strong was the feeling against abolition, that Mr. Wilberforce, the embodiment of abolition in his time, solemnly declared, in the face of all Europe, "that it was against the *slave trade*, not slavery, that his efforts were directed." But no sooner did his party get the power than they proceeded to abolish slavery, and coolly retorted upon their opponents that they never had intended anything else! Sir, it seems to me that those who imagine the Republican party has no other mission than to oppose the *extension* of slavery into the territories, might learn something from the history of the progress of anti-slavery in this and other countries. Not only in regard to slavery, but it is the teaching of all history that the radical element and the extreme men must ultimately give tone and direction to every organization into which they enter. Preceding the great rebellion in England nothing more was sought at first by those who fomented it, than to resist the *extension* of the Royal Prerogative, but the radical principle that seized the multitude was opposition to all monarchy, and it could not be appeased till Cromwell led his trained bands through fire and blood over the ruins of the English throne, and Charles first was brought to the block. Look at revolutionary France. The Girondists were the republicans of that era and they are a fit prototype in the history of the conservative republicans of this country; co-operating with them to a certain extent, but more radical in their character, like the Garrisonians of the present day, were the Jacobins, differing in degree but not in kind, like the difference of two colored strands plaited into one. At first the Girondists had the ascendancy in the French Assembly and directed the Revolution. They aimed only to raise a Republic on the ruins of the ancient *regime*, after the models of antiquity, mirrored in the splendid speculations of their philosophers. But they called into action and fostered a power which they could not control, and history has recorded that the dreadful war which ravaged Europe for twenty years was provoked by their declamations, and the Reign of Terror flowed from the principles they promulgated. They were superceded and supplanted by the more revolutionary Jacobins whom they nursed into life, who finally directed the French Revolution, and who sent forth the sanguinary despots that deluged France in blood. La Fayette, Mirabeau and Roland, the moderate Republicans, who paused and revolted at the excesses of crime and wickedness, were proscribed and set aside for Robespierre, Danton and Murat, the *ultra* Republicans, the representative men of more violent doctrines, and instead of an orderly republic, the world was shocked with the spectacle of bloody anarchy and daring blasphemy, when the *sans culotte* reigned supreme; when beneath sacred roofs licentious songs succeeded to holy strains, and the infamous rites of Venus usurped the place

of worship of the Most High, and she herself sat on the throne of the Holy of Holies within the Cathedral walls of Notre Dame, to receive the incense of her new adorers! Truly, sir, "is History philosophy teaching by example." As the foundations of society in that ill-fated country were torn up by the genius of desolation, it seemed as if the God of nations, who holds in his hands the destinies of all things, was writing in characters of blood upon the bosom of France the fatal results of all attempts to make sudden transitions in the social order, or to confer upon any race or nation institutions which it is not fitted to receive. As one by one the victims of a sanguinary despotism were led up the narrow way to the scaffold, it is not strange that Madame Roland, the friend of true liberty, as she bowed before its gigantic statue at the place of execution, should have pronounced the memorable words: "O, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" An exclamation which has already been repeated with us as we have seen the heads of the conservative and the patriotic fall under the political guillotine! Whilst Republican orators and presses seem to feel secure from any charge of responsibility in the Harper's Ferry affair, their attention might be called to an incident in French history. When the church property was about to be confiscated the Abbe Sieyes, who had been an original republican, was hissed and coughed down when he strove to resist the iniquitous proceeding. Next day he gave vent to his spleen to Mirabeau, who replied: "My dear Abbe, *you have loosed the bull, do you expect he is not to make use of his horns?*"

But, Mr. Speaker, we have also an example about this time of what may be expected by the application of these doctrines to the slave population. The teachings of the revolutionary leaders of France extended to her distant colonies and incited an uprising of the slaves, without a parallel in history for its cruelties and its horrors. The passions of the negroes were excited by the efforts of a society styled "the Society of the Friends of the Blacks," and an insurrection was planned by their instigation. At length the Island of St. Domingo was involved in conflagration and filled with murder and rapine, whilst crowds of slaves traversed the country with the heads of white infants affixed on their pikes, which served as the standards of their furious assemblages! When the news of the revolt was received, an angry discussion was provoked in the French Assembly. Brissot, a vehement opponent of slavery, the Giddings of that day, ascribed it to the refusal of the blessings of freedom to the negroes! the conservatives, to the inflammatory addresses circulated among the slaves by the Anti-Slavery Society of Paris! It strikes me, sir, that I have heard something of this kind since the attempted insurrection in Virginia. It strikes me that I have heard it said that it was not the anti-slavery teaching of the North which is to be charged with responsibility, but it is with those who have the institution of slavery in their midst. France finally acted upon the counsels of the friends of

emancipation, and the nominal blessings of freedom were conferred upon St. Domingo. But how has the experiment operated? "The philanthropists who conferred upon an ignorant slave population the precipitate gift of freedom did them a greater injury than their worst enemies. The black population remain to this day in St. Domingo, a memorable example of the ruinous effects of precipitate emancipation; profligate, idle and disorderly, they have declined both in numbers and happiness; from being the greatest sugar plantation in the world, the island has been reduced to the necessity of importing that valuable produce; and the inhabitants, naked and voluptuous, are fast receding in the state of nature, from which their ancestors were torn two centuries ago, by the rapacity of Christian avarice."

Mr. Speaker, history is replete with another important lesson: that at the first incept of disorganizing doctrines, it is always with the power of the friends of law and order by prompt and firm combination among themselves to throttle them in their birth; "that the danger of such doctrines arises not from their immediate, but from their ultimate consequences not from those who originate, but those who follow them up. The fever of revolution seizes the minds of the restless part of mankind, and the prudent soon become unable to stem the torrent. Representatives, let us hope that the dreadful lessons have not been taught in vain that generations have not perished by violence and public order dissolved in chaos, only make way for the repetition of the same error by future ages; and that from the sanguinary annals of its sufferings the great truth may be learned that there can be no liberty without law, and that "nothing can retard the march of freedom so much as the violence of its supporters."

Mr. Scott, of Warren, moved to strike out the 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th resolutions, and insert certain resolutions denouncing slavery as evil, &c.

Mr. Parrot moved to amend still further.

The previous question was demanded and sustained.

Mr. Woods demanded a division of the question.

The question being on striking out the 1st, 2d, 3d and 4th resolutions,

The yeas and nays were demanded, ordered and resulted—yeas 48, nays 39, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were—Messrs. Baldwin, Blakeslee, Browne, Burr, Bass, Collings, Davis, Gore, Haddox, Hamilton, Harlan, Herrick, Hills, Hitchcock, Howell, Jolly, Kennedy, Krum, McClung, McCune, McGavran, McPherson, Miller, Monahan, Nigh, Parrot, Plants, Rees, of Morro Robinson, Rukensbrod, Scott, of Jefferson, Scott of Warren, Sears, Squire, Stedman, Stubb Thompson, of Summit, Truesdell, Vanvorhis Vincent, Voris, Walker, Watt, Welsh, Woodwright, of Warren, Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were—Messrs. Andrews, Blecker, Carlisle, Convers

Fy, Fellows, Flagg, Gamble, House, Hughes, Cheson, Jacobs, Jonas, McConnell, McSchool, Moore, Myers, Noble, Parr, Pearce, Pow, Reisinger, Schiff, Stiers, Stout, Tanney, Thompson, of Perry, White, Winner, pods.

The following is the vote by which Mr. Har-
 son's "Invasion bill" was indefinitely post-
 ed:

Those who voted in the affirmative were—
 Messrs. Breck, Brewer, Bonar, Collins, Coz,
 Cuppy, Garfield, Glass, Laskey, Monroe, Morse,
 Parish, Potts, Potwin, Smith, Sprague, Stanley,
 Walker—18.

Those who voted in the negative were—
 Messrs. Eason, Ferguson, Foster, Harrison,
 Holmes, Jones, Key, McCall, Newman, Orr,
 Perrill, Ready, Schleich, White—15.